

Application No. 10/615,627
Amendment Dated April 10, 2006
Reply to Office Action Dated February 1, 2006

REMARKS

Paragraph 1 on page 1 of the specification has been amended as required by the Examiner in paragraph 6 of the Office Action under response.

Claims 64, 98 and 106 have been amended as suggested by the Examiner in paragraph 7 of the Action. Claim 113 has also been corrected to include the paragraph inadvertently omitted from the July 18, 2005 amendment, but has not been identified as "currently amended" since the paragraph was never actually deleted.

That leaves for consideration the rejection of the claims under 35 USC § 102, the basis for which resides in the Examiner's finding that priority of the present application extends back to only August 10, 1999. The Examiner's stated reason for finding a priority date of August 10, 1999 is that continuation-in-part application 09/371,425 (now US Patent 6,319,552), with a filing date of August 10, 1999, describes and claims subject matter not present in the next (immediately prior) case in the chain of priority, that being application 09/076,694 (now US Patent 5,968,270).

Applicant acknowledges that successor CIP 09/371,425 describes subject matter not found in predecessor 09/076,694, as indeed it is expected to do, since it is a CIP. However, that is not the "priority" test of MPEP 2133.01, the first sentence of which states:

When applicant files a continuation-in-part whose claims are not supported by the parent application, the effective filing date is the filing date of the child CIP.

Application No. 10/615,627
Amendment Dated April 10, 2006
Reply to Office Action Dated February 1, 2006

Thus, the test for priority is not whether the child CIP application describes subject matter not found in the parent application, but whether the claims of the child CIP are supported by the parent application.

For reasons to be discussed below, it will be seen that the claims of child CIP application 09/371,425 are, in fact, supported by predecessor parent application 09/076,694. In this connection, while not specifically identified by the Examiner, applicant assumes that the Examiner considers the "variable width outlet orifice" in the claims of child CIP application 09/371,425 as that which is not supported by parent application 09/076,694, and therefore as providing a basis for an August 10, 1999 priority date for the child CIP application.

Attached for the examiner's convenience is a copy of parent patent 5,968,270, which issued from parent 09/076,694 application. Also attached are a copy of an Affidavit of Dr. Michael Trefz, which was filed in the prosecution of the parent application, and of patent 5,603,767, which was Exhibit A for Dr. Trefz's affidavit. The claims of parent patent 5,968,270 call for a "variable width outlet orifice", and the Affidavit of Dr. Michael Trefz, which was accepted by the Examiner of the parent 09/076,694 application, states that the disclosure of the parent application teaches a "variable width outlet orifice", and therefore provides support for the recitation in the claims of a "variable width outlet orifice". Thus, parent application 09/076,694 provides support for the claims of child CIP application 09/371,425. In this connection, it is noted that while child CIP application added Fig. 7, which shows an alternate

Application No. 10/615,627
Amendment Dated April 10, 2006
Reply to Office Action Dated February 1, 2006

structure for adjusting outlet orifice width, other arrangements for adjusting outlet orifice width were already found in the structures of Figs. 2 and 4.

Consequently, if applicant is correct in assuming that it is the "variable width outlet orifice" in the claims of child CIP application 09/371,425 that the Examiner finds is not supported by parent application 09/076,694, then it is submitted that the Examiner made an erroneous finding and that child CIP application 09/371,425, and therefore the present application, are entitled to a priority date of September 11, 1992.

Accordingly, as the September 11, 1992 priority date of the present application is prior to the effective date of Ueberschar et al. patent 5,785,253 as a reference, it is requested that Ueberschar et al. be removed as a reference and that the 35 USC §102 rejection of the claims be withdrawn.

As all of the claims remaining in the application appear to be allowable, favorable reconsideration and early passage of the application to allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert A. Lloyd, Reg. No. 25,694
Pyle & Piontek
221 N. LaSalle Street - Suite 2036
Chicago, IL 60601
(312) 236-8123